DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 518 EC 103 587

AUTHOR Overline, Harry M.
TITLE Mainstreaming - Making It Happen.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Oct 77
GRANT 76-22A
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Principals; *Regular Class Placement; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Attitudes and mainstreaming skills of 264 educational personnel (regular classroom teachers, principals, and special education teachers) were surveyed. Results of the Classroom Mainstreaming Inventory and the Survey on Mainstreaming indicated that Ss had positive attitudes toward mainstreaming all 10 categories of exceptional children (including emotionally disturbed, orthopedically handicapped, and speech impaired). For four categories (intelligence, vision, hearing, and emotional problems), principals had significantly more positive attitudes than regular or special teachers. Ss with 1 or more years experience with mainstreaming tended to have more positive attitudes than Ss without experience, and rural Ss had more positive attitudes than suburban and urban Ss. Twenty-five items (including regular teacher preparation, use of a behavioral management approach, and positive teacher attitudes toward exceptional children) were rated as important for successful mainstreaming. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149514

MAINSTREAMING - MAKING IT HAPPEN

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Harry M. Overline, Project Director
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Psychology
California State University, Hayward

Prepared Under Grant No. 76-22A Between the

California State Department of Education and

Dr. Harry M. Overline

October 1977
(Date of Submission)

EC103587

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study conducted during the 1976-77 academic year. Two hundred and sixty-four educational personnel were stratified by their professional position (regular classroom teachers, principals, and special education teachers), geographic area (urban, suburban, and rural), and whether or not they had experience with mainstreaming exceptional children.

The entire sample was administered 2 tests. One was designed to measure their attitudes toward mainstreaming, and the other, a survey was designed to determine which skills, services, training, and facilities were, in the opinion of the respondents, most important for successful mainstreaming.

Results indicated that educational personnel have positive attitudes toward the mainstreaming of exceptional children. These positive attitudes existed for all of the ten categories covered by the study. In four of the ten categories (intelligence, vision, hearing, and emotional problems), principals held significantly more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than regular or special teachers.

Additional results revealed that personnel with one or more years of experience with mainstreaming tended to have more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than their counterparts without experience. Rural educational personnel held significantly more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming than did suburban and urban personnel.

Finally, educational personnel rated 25 of the 27 items (describing the importance of regular teacher preparation, student preparation, services, facilities, and training) as being important for the successful facilitation of the mainstreaming process.

FOREWORD

Statement of Funding:

The study reported here was part of a program of research in Special Education carried out in nine California school districts.

The study was carried out during the academic year, 1976-77, under the auspices of the Special Education Research Program, supported by Grant No. 76-22-A between the State Department of Education and Dr. Harry M. Overline.

Disclaimer:

The full report is reproduced here in this form for distribution as a technical report under the grant, and in order to make complete findings available for others engaged in this research area. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigator. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education is not implied.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to express my appreciation to the staffs of the nine California schools districts (San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Novato, Richmond, Hacienda La Puente, Solano County, and San Diego County) that participated in the study.

A note of special thanks to Dr. Marguerite Dugger, Dr. John Mathey, and Dr. Tom Whalen for their critical comments and contributions to this study, and finally to Ms. Kathleen Levdar whose loving energy provided me the support necessary to complete this research project.

Harry M. Overline

Principal Investigator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
FOREWARD DISCLAIMER AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	1
CONTEMPORARY MAINSTREAMING INFLUENCES	2
DEFINITION OF MAINSTREAMING	3
Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming	6
Mainstreaming Procedures	8
Inservice Training	9
Resource Rooms and Support Personnel	9
Summary	10
II. METHODS	
RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	10
HYPOTHESIS	11
SAMPLING	11
INSTRUMENTS	13
PROCEDURES	14
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	15
III. DATA PRESENTATION	15
IV. RESULTS	29
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming	15
1a.	ANOVA - Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming (position - area)	16
2.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming - Experience	16
2a.	ANOVA - Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming	16
3.	Cell Means for the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming of the Various Categories of Exceptional Children	17
4.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children - With Intelligence Problems	18
5.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Intelligence Problems - Experience	18
5a.	Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Intelligence Problems - Experience	18
6.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Hearing Problems	19
7.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Emotional Problems	19
8.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children With Visual Problems	20
9.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children With Seizure Problems	20
10.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Seizure Problems - Experience	20
11.	Means for the Items on the Survey on Mainstreaming	21
12.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Regular Teachers' Preparation for Mainstreaming	24

Table		Page
13.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Student Preparation for Mainstreaming	24
14.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinions of the Importance of Student Preparation for Mainstreaming - Experience	24
15.	Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Preparation for Mainstreaming - Experience	25
16.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Auxiliary Personnel for Mainstreaming	25
17.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Auxiliary Personnel for Mainstreaming - Experience	25
18.	Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Auxiliary Personnel for Mainstreaming - Experience	26
19.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming	26
20.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming	27
21.	ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming - Experience	27
22.	Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming	27

I. Historical Overview and Literature Review

A. Historical Perspective

Although mainstreaming is a relatively new term in education, its basic concept (the integration of exceptional children into the mainstream of education) has been evolving during the last few decades. Reynolds (1974) in reviewing the history of special education characterized four major periods. These include the following:

1. Evaluation of residential schools in the last 19th century.

2. The development of community prototypes of residential schools during the first 50 years of this century. These prototypes developed slowly because of the negative attitudes that communities held toward exceptional children.

3. The period between 1950 and 1970 was characterized by a rapid proliferation of special self-contained classes for all categories of exceptional children.

4. The current period starting around 1970 and focusing on the integration of formerly segregated exceptional individuals into the mainstream of "regular education."

In summarizing these four historical periods, moving from total isolation to progressive inclusion, Reynolds (1974) states,

> Handicapped children have come from total neglect, first into isolated residential schools, for just a few, and lately into more integrated arrangements for many children. In the long view, the current mainstreaming trend is not a minor pendulum swing or a temporary enthusiasm. It is a steady, progressive, inclusive trend and a trend, I believe, that testifies to a kind of moral development which I unashamedly claim for our society (p. 10).

Educational mainstreaming refers to programs whose philosophy is to integrate exceptional children into the "mainstream" of education, regardless of the amount of time the child spends in the regular class. As previously indicated it has been developing rapidly during the last 5 - 7 years receiving its impetus from the converging of three major forces.

B. Contemporary Mainstreaming Influences

1. Litigation

The first and by far the most influential force was litigation. Beginning with the Hobson vs. Hansen decision, Judge Skelly Wright ordered the existing tracking system in Washington, D.C. schools abolished. He noted that, even ir concept, the track system is undemocratic and discriminatory. Additional litigation was then initiated in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts which challenged the basic discriminatory nature of special education labeling and placement procedures.

These suits led to further decisions. One California case, "Covanubias vs. San Diego Unified School District in 1972 resulted in the award of nominal money damages to Chicano children assigned to EMR classes; a second suit, Larry P. vs. San Francisco School District (a final decision is expected in this case at any time) provoked a temporary injunction halting the assignment of black students to EMR classes until a racially-unbiased intelligence test could be prepared. Although an intelligence test score was only one of numerous criteria necessary to label a child as retarded in actual practice (in many cases) it was the sole criterion utilized.

Other landmark decisions (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania/Mills vs. Board of Education) in Federal courts declared all children are constitutionally entitled to a free appropriate public education (Kirp - 1974).

2. Contribution of the Professional Press

The second force converging with litigation to spearhead the mainstreaming movement was the contribution of the professional press (studies and articles questioning the efficacy of full time, self-contained special education placement.

These initial articles (Dunn, 1968; Lilly, 1971; Christopolos and Renz, 1969) pointed out the paradox that mentally handicapped children, although receiving remedial instruction from specially trained teachers and enrolled in expensive classrooms designed to focus on their unique psychological and educational needs, were accomplishing their educational objectives at a significantly lower level than similar mentally handicapped children who were not receiving special services and had been forced to remain in regular classrooms.

Although these initial articles were primarily concerned with the mildly retarded, a myriad of articles, studies, conferences, demonstration programs, etc. began to appear which also questioned the value of full-time segregated special education for the entire range of exceptionalities.

3. Recent Legislation

The final force giving impetus to the mainstreaming movement has been the enactment of state and federal statutes. During the last five years, numerous states have passed mandatory special education laws. These laws have clearly delineated the responsibilities of individual school districts, county school districts, as well as the State Education Agencies.

The landmark Federal legislation, Education for All The Handicapped Act Public Law 94-142, extends free appropriate public education nationwide. In the opinion of many experts, the implementation of this law will have an unparalleled impact on the extension of special services to previously unserved exceptional individuals. Additionally, it is expected that the quality of services will be significantly upgraded throughout the country.

Although mainstreaming isn't explicitly mandated in the law, one of its major tenants is the placement of exceptional individuals in the "least restrictive environment." Although not synonymous with mainstreaming, placing children in "least restrictive environments," will certainly encourage mainstreaming efforts.

C. Definition of Mainstreaming

With the passage of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Act - 1975, "Mainstreaming" ("least restrictive environment") became a reality for both the handicapped and the non-handicapped in our society.

A review of the literature revealed a plethora of definitions on mainstreaming. Birch (1976) defined mainstreaming as the enrolling and teaching of exceptional children in regular classes for the majority of the school day under the charge of the regular class teacher, and assuring that the exceptional child receives needed special education services. (Reynolds (1974) defined "mainstreaming" as the principle of educating the most children in the same classroom and providing special

education based on learning needs rather than on categories of handicaps.

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development (1976) defined "mainstreaming" as the conscientious effort to place handicapped children into the least restrictive educational setting which is appropriate to their needs.

In this study, "mainstreaming" refers to the process of meeting the needs of exceptional children in regular classrooms on a full or part time basis appropriate to the specific child and class.

Gickling and Theobald (1974) described the rapid momentum of the mainstreaming movement by noting that,

> Mainstreaming is cited so frequently that one might mistakenly think it a magic elixir rather than a particular orientation toward supplying special education services for the majority of the mildly handicapped.

They further point out that neither results of articles which were critical of mainstreaming nor the admission of methodological deficiencies in efficacy studies has slowed down the mainstreaming movement. They describe the most often quoted articles advocating mainstreaming (Dunn, 1968; Christopolos and Renz, 1969; and Lilly, 1970) as being based on a philosophical rather than a research foundation, in that they did not furnish original research to the data field.

Cruikshank (1975) has cautioned that the movement (mainstreaming) toward integration of the handicapped is impregnated at the most with the reality of failures; at the least with dangers to the children purported to be served.

To state that mainstreaming is an idea whose time has arrived is to harbor a simplistic hope that, by simply integrating handicapped children into regular education programs, the benefits attributed to mainstreaming will naturally evolve. Stannard (1976) noted his concern when he said that

> Too many teachers have been instructed, have been very well taught, have been convinced that one of their professional duties is to identify, locate, and assist in the placement of exceptional children in special classes. We have been trained to exclude, not to accept and include.

Martin (1976), in sharing a similar concern, described the current barriers to effective mainstreaming by noting,

> First is the question of attitudes, fears, anxieties and possibly overt rejection, which may face handicapped children, not just from their school mates, but from adults in the schools. Principals, teachers, and teacher aides are after all, only human. Their attitudes are created by their experiences and most have had no formal training or experience with the handicapped child.

It seems clear from this discussion that mainstreaming is, and will continue to be for some time, controversial. Our empirical data base is extremely lean, and the data we do have fraught with considerable methodological foibles, that the verdict on the effectiveness of mainstreaming may not, if ever, be clear in the near future. However, it does seem clear from the literature that if mainstreaming is to be effective, significant changes in attitudes will be necessary.

2. Attitudes

The classic definition of attitudes articulated by Allport (1935) continues to be the one most frequently quoted in research on attitudes. He defined an attitude as a mental or neutral state of readiness; organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual (p. 798).

Triandis (1971) in speculating on why individuals have attitudes included the following reasons:

a. To help them understand the world around them, by organizing and simplifying very complex inputs from their environment.

b. To protect their self-esteem by making it possible for them to avoid unpleasant truths about themselves.

c. To help them adjust in a complex world, by making it more likely that they will react so as to maximize their rewards from the environment.

d. To allow them to express their fundamental values.

Schorn (1976) in discussing what an attitude on mainstreaming is defined it as,

> a relatively enduring organization of beliefs about children with various degrees and types of handicapping conditions predisposing a teacher to accept or reject these children into the regular school program.

It becomes clear, in the context of Triandis' comments of why individuals have attitudes, why many regular classroom teachers hold negative attitudes toward the mainstreaming of handicapped children. First, by rejecting responsibility for educating the handicapped in the regular classroom, the teacher is able to protect his/her self-esteem by minimizing opportunities for their possible teaching failure. Secondly, by displaying negativism toward the handicapped and their integration, the teacher can maintain a sense of compatibility with the larger society and reinforce commonly held public attitudes toward the handicapped.

3. Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming

Most authors in discussing mainstreaming efforts emphasize the potential problems associated with integrating exceptional children into classes whose teachers hold negative attitudes toward mainstreaming (Valletutti, 1969; Reger, 1972).

Results of a study by Shotel, Iano and McGettigan, indicate that integrating handicapped children into regular classes with supportive services provided by resource rooms had slight, if any, effects on teachers' attitudes in mainstreaming.

Another study by Guerin (1974) evaluated the attitudes of teachers and administrators in eight California school districts. The results indicated that 62% of the teachers had positive attitudes toward mainstreaming, 19% were neutral, and 19% were negative. There was a high correlation between the attitudes of special education teachers in the same building. Guerin pointed out the interesting phenomenon that staff members most distant from the actual mainstreaming process, i.e.central office administrators, were consistently more positive in their attitudes than the staff closest to mainstreaming efforts (teachers).

This phenomenon was first noticed by Barngrover (1971) who interviewed 50 educators (i.e. teachers, administrators, and school psychologists). These educators were directly involved in educating the handicapped. Through the interviewing procedure, Barngrover sought to determine their attitudes toward integration of the handicapped into regular education. The results revealed that 27 of the 50 respondents felt special class placement, as a service delivery model, should be retained. Some of the reasons they gave included less disruption in the

classroom, less frustration for the handicapped, and more individualized attention.

The reasons the 23 respondents who favored integration of the handicapped into the regular classroom gave included the following:

a. Greater stimulation for the handicapped child.

b. Better peer behavior models.

c. Higher expectations for academic and social achievement.

d. The failure of special classes to meet the special needs of the handicapped.

Further analysis revealed significant differences between the program preferences of the various personnel interviewed. Regular classroom teachers tended to favor continuation of the special class (self-contained) model, while administrators and school psychologists favored integration of the mildly handicapped.

Bradfield, Kaplan, et. al. (1973) conducted a two-year study of the North Sacramento Model Program to evaluate the efficacy of a mainstreaming program for educable mentally impaired, and educationally handicapped students. Three variables were measured (student achievement, self-concept, and student behavior).

The results revealed that both handicapped and non-handicapped children made positive academic and social gains.

Teacher gains (using a Semantic Differential for two factors - evaluative and familiarity and ten concepts such as the average child, speech defective, etc.) were less evident. When attitudinal change did occur, it tended to be of small magnitude and in a negative direction).

Another attitudinal study that focused exclusively on administrators (i.e. principals) by Payne and Murray (1974), revealed significant differences between principals who worked in urban and suburban settings in their attitudes toward mainstreaming. Seventy-one percent of suburban principals indicated acceptance of the concept of mainstreaming while only 40.3 percent of urban principals accepted it (this difference was statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. A breakdown of the attitudes toward mainstreaming of the various exceptionalities included the following:

EXCEPTIONALITY	SUPPORT FOR MAINSTREAMING	
	SUBURBAN	URBAN
Visually Handicapped	97.6	53.6
Hard of Hearing	92.9	57.0
Physically Handicapped	88.1	53.6
Emotionally Handicapped	64.3	25.0
EMR	59.3	46.4
TMR	9.5	3.6

4. Mainstreaming Procedures

A Master's Thesis by Susan Davis evaluated the opinion of special educators of various recommended procedures for mainstreaming. They were asked to rank the importance on a questionnaire of such variables as the following:

a. Group counseling for exceptional children before integration.

b. Preparation of the regular class before mainstreaming.

c. Behavior management techniques.

d. Training the exceptional child's behavior after integration.

e. Yearly evaluations.

f. A specialist to demonstrate techniques in class.

g. Teacher released time for consultation.

h. A specialist to develop individual programs for exceptional children.

i. A teacher for small groups.

j. Short term instruction of exceptional children.

k. Trained aides.

l. Etc.

In all, there were 36 items covering the areas of instructional procedures, student preparation, auxiliary personnel, and facilities. Eighty-two percent of the 100 questionnaires were returned. Generally, the special education administrators were positive toward the concept of mainstreaming and rated all but 2 of the 36 items highly. These 2 procedures included the use of a homeroom in which the exceptional child would begin and end each day, and providing adaptive training for exceptional children after they have been mainstreamed. Most respondents felt that training should be provided prior to mainstreaming.

5. Inservice Training

The importance of inservice education has been underscored by several authors. Yates, 1973, indicated that "the importance of developing effective continuing or inservice education models for regular classroom teachers appears crucial if mainstreaming is to occur successfully."

Bentness (1971) recommended inservice training to make regular teachers aware of mainstreaming efforts within a district and to instruct them in their use of the program. Inservice training of specific competencies that would facilitate mainstreaming was also recommended by Birch (1971).

6. Resource Rooms and Support Personnel

The efficacy of resource rooms as an alternative to special self-contained classrooms for children diagnosed as educable mentally-retarded was investigated by Walker (1974). There were no significant differences in self-concept between children receiving resource room services and control children in self-contained classes. However, children receiving the resource room services were significantly better academically and socially at each testing than their counterparts in the special class. Another study by Iano, Ayers, Heller, McGettigan and Walker (1974) investigated the sociometric status of retarded children receiving supportive resource room services. The results suggest that educable children in the study were apparently not any better accepted in the regular classes than were educable children in previous studies who had not received such supportive services.

Dunn (1968) was one of the first to encourage the use of a "resource teacher" to facilitate mainstreaming. The role of the resource teacher would be to plan educational programs and goals for students with their regular classroom teachers and provide small group instruction on a part-time basis for children with special needs. Since Dunn's article, a myriad of other authors have recommended that such a role be adopted by public schools. Deno and

Gross pointed out that one of the critical variables in mainstreaming programs in the Minneapolis public schools was the "special education resource teacher." This role is similar to the one described by Lilly (1971) as the "instructional specialist" and Prouty's Diagnostic/ Prescriptive Teacher. These latter roles focus on assessment rather than actual instructional services to children.

7. Summary

In summary, the preceding review of the literature on attitudes toward mainstreaming, mainstreaming procedures, inservice training, resource rooms, and support personnel reveals the following.

a. There is a significant variance between suburban and urban principals in their acceptance of mainstreaming for various types of exceptionalities.

b. The attitudes toward mainstreaming of special education personnel and regular teachers in the same building appear to be positively correlated.

c. Research studies have demonstrated that regular teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children and their mainstreaming into regular classrooms can be changed.

d. Many regular teachers express a bias favoring self contained special classes over placement of exceptional children in regular classrooms.

e. Educational personnel (classroom teachers) closest to mainstreaming efforts appear less positive in their attitudes toward mainstreaming than personnel further away from the classroom.

f. Inservice education for regular teachers appears to be an important component of successful mainstreaming efforts.

g. Support models (i.e. resource rooms and resource teacher consultants) appear to be effective strategies in facilitating mainstreaming.

II. Methods

A. Restatement of the Problem

This study was designed to measure the similarities and differences among educational personnel in their attitudes toward mainstreaming and their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services needed to successfully facilitate mainstreaming.

B. Hypotheses

1. Are there significant differences among educational personnel (regular teachers, principals, and special teachers) in their overall attitudes toward mainstreaming?

2. Are there significant differences in attitudes toward mainstreaming between educational personnel who have had at least one year of experience with mainstreaming and those who have had no experience?

3. Are there significant differences among educational personnel (urban, suburban, and rural) in their attitudes toward mainstreaming?

4. Are there significant differences among educational personnel in their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services needed to successfully facilitate mainstreaming?

5. Are there significant differences in their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services, between educational personnel who have had at least one year of experience with mainstreaming and those who have had no experience?

6. Are there significant differences among educational personnel (urban, suburban, rural) in their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services needed to facilitate mainstreaming?

C. Sampling

The population (universe) for this study included all public school principals, regular teachers, and special teachers in the State of California. The actual sample consisted of 264 educational personnel (78 regular teachers, 66 principals, 120 special education teachers) currently employed in California public school districts. The study's sample was selected in the following way:

1. All public agencies currently piloting the Special Education Master Plan, all Title VI-B and Title IV-C projects concerned with mainstreaming (excluding all first year projects), and other districts "experienced" with mainstreaming (as indicated in conversations between the principal investigator and the California Department of Education) were identified as potential participants in the study.

   The districts were then stratified into whether they could be classified as urban, suburban, or rural. Districts were then randomly selected (in each category -- urban, suburban, and rural) and a hierarchy (1-5 in each category) was

established for the 15 districts initially selected.

The principal investigator telephoned the director of special education in the first three districts of each geographic category.

The purpose of the telephone call was to outline the study and inquire whether the district might be interested in participating. When the Special Education Director expressed an interest, a formal written proposal was forwarded to the district's superintendent indicating the following:

a. Outline of the study.

b. Description of the data collection instruments.

c. Assurance of confidentiality.

d. Project time line.

e. The date by which the principal investigator should receive formal written approval that the district intends to participate or not.

The Special Education Directors received a copy of the superintendent's letter and a letter to them emphasizing the importance of the research and a request that they contact their superintendent to serve as an advocate for the research.

Whenever a district declined interest in participating in the study, the principal investigator then contacted the 4th (and 5th if necessary) district which was randomly selected in each of the three geographical areas.

The districts which participated in the study included the following:

1. Urban

   a. San Francisco Unified School District

   b. Oakland Unified School District

   c. San Jose Unified School District

2. Suburban

   a. Novato Unified School District

   b. Richmond Unified School District

   c. Hacienda La Puente

3. Rural

   a. Solano County School District

   b. San Diego County School District

Districts which declined to participate included:

1. Sacramento Unified School District
2. Los Angeles City Unified School District
3. Fresno Unified School District
4. Redlands Unified School District
5. Mt. Diablo Unified School District
6. Tulare County - RIA
7. Humboldt - Del Norte - RIA

Because of the methodological difficulties of selecting appropriately matched districts to serve as the control group, each experimental district served as its own control. This permitted a perfect matching on such variables as socio-economic level, geographical area, size of the district, etc. One-half of the personnel from a given districts with experience in mainstreaming served as the experimental group, and the remaining half, who had no experience with mainstreaming, were designated the control group.

D. Instruments

The following data-collection instruments were utilized in this study:

1. Attitudes

   Classroom Mainstreaming Inventory * (Appendix A)

   This inventory was designed by Dr. Noris Haring (University of Washington) for his doctoral dissertation. It measures attitudes toward the mainstreaming of the following categories of exceptional children:

   a. Emotionally Disturbed.

   b. Behavior Disorders.

   c. Visually Handicapped.

   d. Hearing Handicapped.

* The title of this instrument was changed from the Classroom Integration Inventory to prevent any misunderstanding regarding racial integration vs. mainstreaming.

e. Speech Handicapped

f. Intelligence

g. Orthopedic/Cardiac

h. Toilet Training

i. Seizure

j. Physical Attractiveness

2. Mainstreaming Skills (teaching skills - auxiliary personnel, facilities and services).

Survey on Mainstreaming (SOM)
This survey was a modification of the "Mainstreaming Survey for Special Education Administrators" developed by Susan Davis (for her Master's Degree thesis requirement) in conjunction with the principal investigator and the "Program Process Checklist for Title I Delinquent and Neglected Programs" developed by the principal investigator for an HEW-OE national study. The Survey on Mainstreaming (Appendix A) is a 41 item survey which measures educational personnel's opinions (on a 1-5 likert scale) in the following areas:

a. Teacher preparation skills needed for successful mainstreaming.

b. Student preparation for successful mainstreaming.

c. Auxiliary personnel needed for successful mainstreaming.

d. Facilities and services for successful mainstreaming.

e. Relative importance of auxiliary personnel for successful mainstreaming.

f. Educational personnel's global attitude toward mainstreaming.

g. Other issues/opinions considered important but not covered in the Survey.

E. Procedures

In all cases, with one exception, (Richmond Unified School District) the Classroom Mainstreaming Inventory and the Survey on Mainstreaming were sent with a cover letter (Appendix A) to the District's Central Office for distribution to individual educational personnel. Information on definitions (i.e. mainstreaming and exceptional children), test taking directions and the date

by which the instruments should be completed, enclosed in a self-addressed envelope, and returned directly to the principal investigator was provided. Richmond Unified School District supplied the names and addresses (work) of their personnel and the principal investigator corresponded directly with them.

F. Statistical Analysis

The data generated by the study was analyzed by an analysis of variance.

III. Data Presentation

This section will present the data appropriate to the study's hypotheses.

A. Hypotheses

1. Are there significant differences among educational personnel (regular teachers, principals, and special teachers) in their overall attitudes toward mainstreaming?

2. Are there significant differences in attitudes toward mainstreaming between educational personnel who have had at least one year of experience with mainstreaming and those who have had no experience?

3. Are there significant differences among educational personnel (urban, suburban, and rural) in their attitudes toward mainstreaming?

Table 1

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	8.94105	10.7672 *
B (area)	2.	2.83048	3.4102 **
AxB	4.	1.18600	1.4282

* P < .001
** P < .05

Table 1-a

Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming (position - Area)

Variable	Cell Means
Special Education Teachers	4.234
Regular Teachers	3.621
Principals	3.850
Urban	3.797
Rural	4.200
Suburban	3.952

An analysis of Table 1 shows significant geographical and position effects.

Although all three groups had a favorable attitude toward mainstreaming, the special education teachers manifested a significantly more positive attitude toward mainstreaming than did the other two froups. Principals were second and regular teachers were third in their overall attitudes toward mainstreaming.

An analysis of Table 1-a revealed that of the 3 geographical groups, rural educational personnel maintained a significantly more positive attitude toward mainstreaming than did the suburban personnel. Urban personnel, although still favorable toward mainstreaming, were the least favorable of the three groups.

Table 2

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming - Experience

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (experience)	5.	6.55534	8.1764 *
within	243.	.80173	
Total	248.	.91773	

* $P < .001$

Table 2-a

Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming

Personnel	Cell Means
Special Education with experience	4.300
Special Education without experience	3.904
Regular teachers with experience	3.708
Regular teachers without experience	3.461
Principals with experience	4.086
Principals without experience	3.071

An analysis of Table 2 reveals that experience appears to have a highly significant effect on educational personnel's attitudes toward mainstreaming. As indicated in Table 2-a, special education teachers with experience maintained the most favorable attitude toward mainstreaming. Principals with experience had the second most favorable attitude, with special education teachers without experience coming in third. Principals without experience, although still falling in the slightly favorable range, were the least favorable of the 6 groups.

Hypotheses (Continued)

4. Are there differences among educational personnel (urban, suburban, and rural) in their attitudes toward the mainstreaming of various categories of exceptional children?

5. Are there differences among educational personnel (regular teachers, principals, and special education teachers) in their attitudes toward the mainstreaming of various categories of exceptional children?

6. Are there differences among educational personnel (urban, suburban, and rural) in their attitudes toward the mainstreaming of various categories of exceptional children?

Table 3

Cell Means for the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming of the Various Categories of Exceptional Children

Category	Cell Mean *
Physical Attractiveness	4.310
Behavior Disorders	3.817
Intelligence	3.787
Orthopedic and Cardiac	3.787
Hearing	3.724
Emotionally Disturbed	3.687
Vision	3.642
Speech	3.503
Seizures	3.368
Toilet Training	3.321

* The higher the mean score, the more favorable the attitudes toward mainstreaming.

The data in Table 3 reveals that educational personnel feel somewhat more positive about mainstreaming children with physical attractiveness problems, behavior disorders, intelligence problems, and orthopedic and cardiac problems, than they do about children with vision, speech, seizures and toilet training problems. It is important to note, however, that even with these latter categories, the educational personnel were generally favorable. A mean score of 3.0 or higher indicates that a student could be handled in a regular classroom with appropriate help. All 10 of the categories were above the 3.0 mean level.

Of the ten exceptional categories, 5 revealed significant differences among the various groups of educational personnel. These included the following:

a. Intelligence

b. Hearing

c. Emotionally Disturbed

d. Vision

e. Seizures

The following tables will present data delineating the significant differences for the 5 exceptional categories.

Table 4

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children - With Intelligence Problems

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	1.00052	
B (area)	2.	.02549	5.0909 *
AxB	4.	.2	.0031
			.9301

* P < .005

Table 5

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Intelligence Problems - Experience

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (experience)	5.	.97901	3.2373 *
within	238.	.30241	
Total	243.	.31633	

* P < .025

Table 5-a

Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Intelligence Problems - Experience

Personnel	Cell Means
Special Education teachers with experience	3.690
Special Education teachers without experience	3.442
Regular teachers with experience	3.055
Regular teachers without experience	3.930
Principals with experience	3.942
Principals without experience	3.028

An analysis of table 4 revealed a highly significant position effect ($p < .005$). Although all three groups (i.e. regular teachers, principals, and special teachers) had positive attitudes toward mainstreaming gifted/retarded children, principals felt the most positive. Table 5a reveals that principals with experience felt more positive than principals without experience. Regular teachers felt the second most positive and special education teachers felt the least positive of the three groups.

Table 6

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Hearing Problems

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	1.23034	3.2106 *
B (area)	2.	.49779	1.2906
AxB	4.	.18649	.4835

* $p < .05$

Principals felt the most positive about mainstreaming (3.858) exceptional children with hearing problems. Regular teachers were second (3.758), and special education teachers, although generally positive, were the least positive of the three groups (3.633). Experience with mainstreaming did not influence the attitudes of educational personnel toward the mainstreaming of children with hearing problems.

Table 7

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Emotional Disturbances

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios *
A (position)	2.	1.23034	3.2105 *
B (area)	2.	.49779	1.2906
AxB	4.	.18649	.4835

*$p < .05$

Table 7 reveals a significant position effect . Although all three groups supported mainstreaming children with emotional disturbances, principals were the most positive (3.820). Regular classroom teachers were second (3.730) in their attitudes toward mainstreaming these children and special education teachers (3.504) were third. Whether personnel had experience with mainstreaming or not did not influence their attitudes toward mainstreaming children with emotional disturbances.

Table 8

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Visual Problems

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (positive)	2.	1.29133	4.8331 *
B (area)	2.	.71030	2.6584
AxB	4.	.10485	

*p < .01

As in the previous tables (i.e. 4-7), the significant position effect in Table 8 reveals that principals had the most favorable attitude toward the mainstreaming of children with vision problems (3.800). Special education teachers were last (3.549) with the regular education teachers falling in between (3.653). Experience did not influence attitudes toward the mainstreaming of visual handicaps.

Table 9

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Seizure Problems

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	2.72373	5.4072*
B (area)	2.	.48819	.9797
AxB	4.	.35836	.7221

*p < .01

Table 10

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Children with Seizure Problems - Experience

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (experience)	5.	1.67039	3.4379 *
within	251.	.48620	
total	256.	.51144	

*p < .05

An analysis of the significant position effect in table 9 revealed a reversal of the trend presented in previous tables. In this case, special education teachers felt the most positive (3.512) about the mainstreaming of children with seizure problems. Principals were second (3.353), and regular teachers a distant third (3.170). It is important to note, however, that all three groups were generally supportive of mainstreaming exceptional children with seizure difficulties.

The data in Table 10 revealed that experience with mainstreaming does have a significantly positive effect on the attitudes of educational personnel regarding the mainstreaming of children with seizure problems. In each group, the personnel with experience scored

higher than those without experience. Special Education teachers with experience manifested the most positive attitude (3.546 to 3.357 Special Education teachers without experience). Principals with experience were second (3.450 to principals without experience 3.007) and regular teachers with experience were third (3.203 to 3.100).

Hypotheses (continued)

7. Are there significant differences among educational personnel in their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services needed to successfully facilitate mainstreaming?

8. Are there significant differences in their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services, between educational personnel who have had at least one year of experience with mainstreaming and those who have had no experience?

9. Are there significant differences among educational personnel (urban, suburban, rural) in their understanding of the teaching skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, and services needed to facilitate mainstreaming?

Table 11

MEANS* FOR THE 39 ITEMS ON THE SURVEY ON MAINSTREAMING

ITEM	MEAN
4. A positive teacher attitude toward exceptional children prior to placement of an exceptional child in that teachers class.....	4.796
5. The regular classroom teacher having knowledge of and a willingness to use community resources for children (anything from recreational facilities to welfare agencies.....	3.937
6. Additional teacher training in specific competencies.....	4.047
7. Group counseling sessions for the exceptional child before he enters a regular class.....	3.900
8. Preparation of the regular class before integration of an exceptional child into that class..	4.176
9. The use of a behavioral management approach (i.e., tangible or token reinforcers, social reinforcement) in mainstreamed classrooms.....	3.345

* The scale ranges from 1 to 5 -- 1 = definitely unimportant, 2 = somewhat unimportant, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = quite important, 5 = vitally important.

	ITEM	MEAN
10.	Training the exceptional child's behavior before integrating him into the regular class.....	3.956
11.	Training the exceptional child's behavior only after integrating him into the regular class...	2.942
12.	Yearly evaluations for exceptional children in regular classes.....	4.528
13.	A specialist available to come into the regular classroom and demonstrate techniques for the teacher.....	4.250
14.	Released time for teachers to consult with specialists concerning exceptional children in their rooms.....	4.440
15.	A specialist to help construct individualized programs for exceptional children in a regular classroom.....	4.476
16.	A specially trained teacher for individual or small group, short-term instruction outside the regular class.....	4.436
17.	A trained para-professional to assist the regular classroom teacher.....	4.233
18.	An itinerant teacher-specialist shared among schools to serve as consultant and temporary instructor.....	3.535
19.	A separate room for individual or small group instruction for integrated exceptional children.....	4.003
20.	A learning center for routine diagnosis of problems and construction of individual prescriptions for exceptional children in mainstreamed programs.....	4.237
21.	A separate class as a home room for all exceptional children where they might begin and end each day and have special instruction.....	2.992
22.	A wide range of abilities and age groups within a mainstreamed school.....	3.498
23.	Individualized instruction, such as prescriptive or precision teaching, for all children in an integrated classroom.....	3.765

	ITEM	MEAN
24.	Parerts of exceptional children involved in the development of an educational program for their child.....	4.236
25.	College courses in mainstreaming required for student teachers.....	3.911
26.	Extension courses required of credentialed teachers taken at their time and expense.....	2.543
27.	A summer training program offered by the district.....	3.403
28.	In-service training programs offered by the school district after school hours during the school year.....	3.480
29.	Training programs offered by the district during class time and requiring released time for teachers.....	3.806
30.	Released time for teachers to visit other districts for observation of their mainstreaming programs.....	3.910
31.	Special education teacher as consultant.....	4.565
32.	Specialist from outside the district.....	2.812
33.	School psychologist.....	4.128
34.	Social worker.....	3.190
35.	Counselor.....	3.858
36.	School nurse.....	4.015
37.	Para-professional aides.....	4.085
38.	Cross-age and peer tutors.....	3.496
39.	Parents.....	4.235

Table 12

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Regular Teacher's Preparation for Mainstreaming

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	.51293	1.6591
B (area)	2.	1.33121	4.3059*
A x B	4.	.41143	1.3308

* $p < .05$

An analysis of Table 12 reveals that the geographic variable (urban, suburban, rural) had a significant effect on how important respondents felt about teacher preparation and mainstreaming. There was no significant position effect. Urban personnel rated regular teachers' preparation for mainstreaming significantly more important (4.412) than did the rural (4.206) or suburban (4.186) personnel. However, the scores for all three groups, rated regular teachers' preparation in the quite important range. A one-way analysis of variance revealed that experience had no significant effect on personnel's rating of the importance of regular teacher preparation for mainstreaming.

Table 13

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Student Preparation for Mainstreaming

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	.20755	.8014
B (area)	2.	.62148	2.3996
A x B	4.	.77053	2.9751

Table 14.

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinions of the Importance of Student Preparation for Mainstreaming Experience

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (experience)	5.	.76547	2.9483 *
Within	215.	.25962	
Total	220.	.27112	

* $p < .025$

Table 15

Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Preparation for Mainstreaming - Experience

Personnel	Cell means
Special Education Teachers with experience	3.769
Special Education Teachers Without Experience	3.728
Regular Teachers With Experience	3.569
Regular Teachers Without Experience	4.017
Principals with Experience	3.758
Principals Without Experience	4.083

The data in Table 13 revealed no significant differences in the way educational personnel rated the importance of student preparation for successful mainstreaming. The data in table 14, however, indicated that experience with mainstreaming did have a significant influence on how importantly student preparation was rated by educational personnel. Interestingly enough, principals without experience rated student preparation higher than the other 5 groups. Regular teachers without experience were second in rating the importance of student preparation. Both of these represented a significant difference over the same personnel with experience. Experience was not a significant influence among special education teachers.

Table 16

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Auxiliary Personnel for Mainstreaming

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	1.54874	6.1987 *
B (area)	2.	.39484	1.5803
A x B	4.	.57890	2.3170

* $p < .005$

Table 17

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Auxiliary Personnel for Mainstreaming - Experience

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (experience)	5.	.92594	3.6558 *
within	240.	.25328	
total	245.	.26700	

*$p < .01$

Table 18

Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Auxiliary Personnel for Mainstreaming - Experience

Personnel	Cell Means
Special Education Teachers With Experience	4.316
Special Education Teachers Without Experience	4.370
Regular Teachers With Experience	3.993
Regular Teachers Without Experience	4.234
Principals With Experience	4.082
Principals Without Experience	4.300

An analysis of the positive position effect noted in table 16 reveals that all three groups (i.e. principals, regular and special teachers) considered auxiliary personnel quite important in the facilitation of mainstreaming. Special education teachers rated auxiliary personnel significantly more important (4.326) than principals (4.129) or regular classroom teachers. The statistically significant effect of experience indicated in table 17 suggests that experience with mainstreaming decreases the reported importance of auxiliary personnel. Regular teachers and principals without mainstreaming experience rated the need for auxiliary personnel significantly higher than did their counterparts with experience. However, experience had very little effect on special education teachers in their ratings of the importance of auxiliary personnel.

Table 19

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	2.	.50866	1.7168
B (area)	2.	.05438	.1835
A x B	4.	.50632	1.7089

The data in Table 19 revealed no significant effects for the position or geographical variables. Additionally, a one-way analysis of variance indicated that experience with mainstreaming did not have a significant effect on the manner in which educational personnel rated the importance of facilities for successful mainstreaming.

Table 20

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (position)	21	4.54711	11.1304*
B (area)	2.	.42353	1.0367
A x B	4.	1.39613	3.4174 **

* $p < .001$ ** $p < .05$

Table 21

ANOVA - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming - Experience

	DF	Mean Squares	F-Ratios
A (experience)	5.	1.94676	4.5462
within	232.	.42821	
total	237.	.46025	

* $p < .01$

Table 22

Cell Means - Educational Personnel's Opinion of the Importance of Facilities for Mainstreaming

Personnel	Cell Means
Special Education Teachers With Experience	3.712
Special Education Teachers Without Experience	3.575
Regular Teachers With Experience	3.261
Regular Teachers Without Experience	3.168
Principals With Experience	3.458
Principals Without Experience	3 316

An analysis of Table 20 revealed two statistically significant effects, position and interaction. Special education teachers rated the need for various types of in-service education significantly higher (3.687) than principals (3.430) or regular classroom teachers (3.226). Further analysis revealed that regular classroom teachers in rural and suburban areas rated significantly lower than those in urban areas. Although there wasn't a sigrificant effect, this trend contributed to the highly significant effect ($p < .001$).

Experience, as indicated in Table 21, had a significant effect on how educational personnel rated the importance of inservice education. In each case, special education teachers, principals, and regular teachers rated inservice education more important than their counterparts without mainstreaming experience. Special education teachers rated the need for inservice education the highest, while principals were second and regular teachers third.

IV. Results

The study was designed to measure educational personnel's attitudes toward mainstreaming exceptional children. Additionally, it was designed to survey educational personnel to determine what skills, services, training, and facilities they believe they would need to successfully mainstream exceptional children.

The following is a list of the results of this study:

1. All three groups of educational personnel supported the general concept of mainstreaming exceptional children.

2. Special education teachers were the most supportive of mainstreaming, while principals were second and regular teachers third.

3. Experience with mainstreaming (defined as 1 year or more) had a positive influence on educational personnel's attitudes toward mainstreaming.

4. Rural educational personnel's attitudes toward mainstreaming were the most positive. Suburban personnel were second and urban personnel third.

5. Educational personnel in this study felt that all of the exceptional categories (10 categories) could be successfully mainstreamed in regular classrooms. These classrooms would either have to be in a building with a full-time specialist, or the regular classroom teacher would have to have access to a specialist or consultant.

6. The following hierarchical list of exceptional categories represents the order in which educational personnel felt exceptional children could be successfully mainstreamed:

   a. Physical attractiveness.

   b. Behavior disorders.

   c. Intelligence.

   d. Orthopedic and Cardiac.

   e. Hearing.

   f. Emotionally disturbed.

   g. Vision.

   h. Speech.

   i. Seizures.

   j. Toilet training.

7. Principals held the most positive attitude toward the mainstreaming of exceptional children with intelligence problems, hearing problems, vision problems, and emotional problems. In each case, regular classroom teachers manifested the second most positive attitudes and special education teachers were third.

8. Experience with mainstreaming had a positive influence on the attitudes of educational personnel regarding the mainstreaming of children with intelligence problems.

9. Special education teachers held the most positive attitudes toward the mainstreaming of exceptional children with seizure problems. Principals were second and regular teachers third.

10. Mainstreaming experience did have a positive influence on the attitudes of educational personnel regarding the mainstreaming of children with seizures problems.

11. All 27 items on the "Survey on Mainstreaming" (with 2 exceptions) describing skills, auxiliary personnel, facilities, services, and training were rated by educational personnel as being somewhat important to quite important in the facilitation of successful mainstreaming. The two exceptions were "the training of the exceptional child's behavior only after integrating him into the regular class," and "a separate class as a home room for all exceptional children where they might begin and end each day and have special instruction."

12. The following hierarchical list represents the opinion of educational personnel as to the relative importance of auxiliary personnel for a successful mainstreaming program:

    a. Special education teacher as a consultant.

    b. Parents.

    c. School Psychologist

    d. Para-professional aides.

    e. School nurse.

    f. Counselor.

    g. Cross-age/peer tutors.

    h. Social Worker.

    i. Specialist from outside the district.

13. Although all three geographic groups rated regular teachers preparation as quite important, urban personnel rated it significantly higher than either the rural or suburban groups.

14. Educational personnel with experience tended to rate the importance of student preparation for successful mainstreaming lower than did their counterparts without experience.

15. Special education teachers rated the importance of auxiliary personnel for successful mainstreaming as being more important than principals or regular teachers. All three groups, however, rated auxiliary personnel in the important range.

16. Special education teachers rated the importance of various types of inservice education as being more important than principals or regular teachers. Also, personnel with mainstreaming experience rated inservice education as being more important than their counterparts without experience.

V. Summary/Recommendations

This study measured educational personnel's attitudes toward the mainstreaming of exceptional children. Educational personnel were stratified into 3 geographic areas (urban, suburban, and rural), and 3 professional position areas (principals, regular classroom teachers, and special education teachers). Educational personnel were also stratified into whether they had had at least one year of experience with mainstreaming or not.

A. The general results of this study indicate that educational personnel have positive attitudes toward the mainstreaming of exceptional children. This positive predilection towards mainstreaming existed for all of the 10 categories of exceptional children covered by the data collection instruments.

The phenomenon (characterized by several researchers) that staff most distant from the actual mainstreaming process were the ones that held the most positive attitudes toward mainstreaming was also evident in this study. For 5 of the exceptional categories, there were no significant differences among educational personnel. However, 4 other exceptional categories than either regular classroom teachers or special education teachers.

Generally speaking, experience with mainstreaming exceptional pupils had a positive influence on the attitudes that educational personnel held toward mainstreaming.

Finally, educational personnel rated 25 of the 27 items (describing the importance of regular teacher preparation, student preparation, services, facilities, and training) as being important for the successful facilitation of the mainstreaming process.

B. Recommendations: It is recommended that:

1. The California Department of Education encourage school districts to develop inservice workshops which would focus on attitudinal change as well as the technical aspects of mainstreaming (i.e. psychoeducational assessment, writing individualized educational plans, monitoring instruction, formative and summative evaluation, due process procedures, and consultation). Too often, inservice focuses exclusively on technical aspects. Since attitudes are predispositions to behavior, they often must be modified before educational personnel are open to and can generalize the technical skills learned in an inservice session, to the application of these skills in an actual classroom setting.

2. Seminars for special education teachers be administered on a county or regional basis. Since special education teachers were the least positive of the educational personnel in their attitudes toward the mainstreaming of children with

intelligence, hearing, vision, and emotional problems, there is a need to explore why this reluctance exists. Particularly in light of the trend noted by Guerin that attitudes of regular teachers are correlated with the attitudes of the special education teachers in the same building.

If special education teachers are lukewarm on the mainstreaming of certain categories of exceptional children, their reticence may, unknowingly, be communicated to the regular staff members.

3. Since experience with mainstreaming seems related to more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming, reluctant regular classroom teachers should be encouraged and supported to experiment on a pilot basis (mainstreaming 1 or 2 children). Their experience with these children may lead to a more positive attitude, and make them more open to trying various methods/techniques in their classrooms.

Bibliography

1. Allport, G.W., "Attitudes," In C. Murchison (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Worcester, Clark University Press, 1935.

2. Barngrover, Elaine, "A Study of Educators' Preferences in Special Education Programs," Exceptional Children, Vol. 37, Summer, 1971, pps. 754-755.

3. Birch, Jack, Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes, Leadership Training Institute in Special Education, University of Minnesota, 1974, pps. 3-7.

4. Bradfield, Robert and Kaplan, Phyllis, et al., 'The Special Child in the Regular Classroom," Exceptional Children, Vol. 39, 1973, pps. 384-390.

5. Christopolos, G. and Renz, P.A., "Critical Examination of Special Education Programs," The Journal of Special Education, Vol. 3, 1969, pps. 371-379.

6. Cruickshank, William M., "Perceptual and Learning Disability: A Definition and Projection," Educational Leadership, Vol. 32, 1975, pps. 499-502.

7. Davis, Susan, "Some Factors Affecting Administrators' Opinions of Recommended Mainstreaming Procedures," Unpublished Masters' Thesis, California State University, Hayward, 1975.

8. Dunn, Lloyd M., "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded - Is Much of it Justifiable?" Exceptional Children, Vol. 35, 1968, pps. 5-22.

9. Gickling, Edward E. and Theobald, John T., "Mainstreaming: Affect or Effect," The Journal of Special Education, Vol. 9, 1975, pps. 317-328.

10. Guerin, Gilbert R., and Szatlocky, Kathleen, "Integration Programs for the Mildly Handicapped," Exceptional Children, Vol. 41, 1974, pps. 173-179.

11. Kirp, "The Sorting Machine," Phi Delta Kappan, 1976.

12. Lilly, M.S., "Special Education: A Teapot in a Tempest," Exceptional Children, Vol. 37, 1970, pps. 43-49.

13. _____, "A Training Based Model for Special Education," Exceptional Children, 1971, pps. 745-749.

14. Martin, Edwin, "Integration of the Handicapped Child into Regular Schools," Mainstreaming: Origins and Implications, leadership Training Institute in Special Education, University of Minn., 1976.

15. Payne, Reed and Murray, Charles, "Principals' Attitudes Toward Integration of the Handicapped," Exceptional Children,1974, pps. 123-124.

16. Reger, Roger, "Let's get Rid of Special Classes, but ...," Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1972, pps. 442-443.

17. Reynolds, Maynard C., "Educating Exceptional Children in Regular Classes," Paper presented at the Leadership Training Institute Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.

18. Schorn, Frank R., "A Study of An Inservice Practicum's Effects on Teachers' Attitudes About Mainstreaming," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1976.

19. Shotel, R., Jay, Richard, Iano, R., McGettigar, James, "Teacher Attitudes Associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children," Exceptional Children, 1972, pps. 677-683.

20. Stannard, Robert, Mainstreaming: Some Basis for Caution," In P.A. O'Donnell and R. Bradfield (Eds.), Mainstreaming: Controversy and Consensus, Academic Therapy Publications, 1976, pps. 141-149.

21. Triandis, Harry C., Attitude and Attitude Change, John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

22. Valletutti, P., 'Integration vs. Segration: A Useless Dialectic," Journal of Special Education, 1959, pps. 405-408.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

Dear Colleague:

In the past, schools have placed exceptional children in special classes which emphasized remedition of handicaps of vision, hearing, mental or physical abilities. During the 1970's, many parents and professionals seriously challenged this model which focuses on differences rather than commonalities of all children. As a result, there is a growing demand for meeting the unusual needs of many exceptional children in regular rather than special classes. A recently passed law, Public Law 94-142, mandates that by 1980, appropriate educational services be provided for all exceptional children in "least restrictive environments".

While the "Mainstream Model" may offer specific advantages for children, both regular and exceptional, adequate planning and support services must be incorporated to assure successful operation. It appears that the mainstreaming trend will significantly alter the roles and responsibilities of special as well as regular class teachers.

Your district was randomly selected, and your Superintendent has approved the participation of approximately 60 teachers and principals in this study. You are being invited to contribute your impressions regarding the mainstreaming of exceptional children. Imput from the field will suggest components and services essential in the new model.

You will find enclosed two checklists to be completed and returned to me in the self-addressed envelope by April 19, 1977. The "Classroom Mainstreaming Inventory" should take approximately 30 minutes to complete and the "Survey on Mainstreaming" an additional 10 minutes.

"Mainstreaming" in this study refers to the process of meeting the needs of exceptional children in regular classrooms on a full or part time basis appropriate to the specific child and class.

"Exceptional children" are those with handicaps/differences in learning, behavior, physical or mental processes. They include such differences as visual disorders, hearing disabilities, speech and language problems, learning disabilities, behavior disorders, social/emotional difficulties, orthopedic problems, multiple handicaps, and giftedness.

I appreciate your participation in developing a service model which may improve educational opportunities for children without making impossible demands upon school personnel. All responses will remain confidential. If you wish an abstract of the study's results, please return the tear off sheet below.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY M. OVERLINE, Ed. D.
Associate Professor
California State University, Hayward

HMO:jb

Please send me an abstract of the data obtained in this study on mainstreaming.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

_____

_____

CLASSROOM MAINSTREAMING INVENTORY *

Teachers are ordinarily faced with a wide variety of problems, arising from the many different kinds of students they work with each day. Below and on the following pages, you will find brief descriptions of the behavior of a number of exceptional children. In each case you are to indicate how you would prefer to handle the situation if the decision were entirely up to you.

DIRECTIONS: Please detach your answer sheet and mark your preference as follows:

A. If you feel that such a student could be handled in a regular classroom without any fundamental change in procedures.

B. If you feel that such a student could be handled in a regular classroom provided advice from a specialist or consultant was occasionally made available whenever the teacher felt a need for such aid in dealing with some particular problem.

C. If you feel that such a student could be handled in a regular classroom provided there was a full-time specialist available at the school who could provide supplementary training for the student and frequent consultation with the teacher.

D. If you feel that such a student would benefit most by being assigned to a special class or school.

E. If you feel that such a child cannot be handled profitably within the context of regular or special public education.

Mark each item clearly on your answer sheet using the A - E legend.

A. In regular classroom
B. In regular classroom with the part-time help of a specialist or consultant.
C. In the regular classroom in a building with a full-time specialist.
D. In a special class or school
E. Not for public education

1. Alfred is defiant and stubborn, likely to argue with the teacher, be willfully disobedient, and otherwise interfere with normal classroom discipline.

2. Barbara wears thick glasses, and her eye-balls jerk spasmodically from side to side; she can't see the blackboard very well, and reads poorly.

3. Chuck can get about only in a wheelchair; someone must move it for him or carry him in their arms, because he is unable to control any of his limbs.

4. Donald is six years old and does not speak very much; what he does say is indistinct and childish, with many missing or incorrect sounds.

5. Earl is eight and wears cowboy boots to class because he hasn't learned to tie his own shoelaces; he is generally cheerful and well-behaved, but talks very little and is incapable of following any but the most simple instructions.

*The Classroom Mainstreaming Inventory is a modification of the Classroom Integration Inventory developed by Dr. Norris Haring.

6. Florence is immature and oversensitive, likely to burst into tears at the slightest provocation.

7. When Alice wears her hearing aid she hears as well as any other youngster; her voice sounds flat and hollow, and is somewhat unpleasant to hear.

8. Suzy frequently gets so excited she loses control of herself and wets the floor.

9. Ruth is very much like other eleven-year olds in most respects but occasionally, during the day, a rhythmical quiver will pass over her face, and she becomes totally oblivious for a few seconds.

10. Roger's face was severely disfigured in an auto accident; although he is completely recovered physically, the surgeons do not expect to be able to make his appearance more acceptable for many years.

11. Alan wears a leg brace and walks with the aid of crutches; he gets along quite well by himself though, and ordinarily needs no help from anyone.

12. Bernard is a bully, given to teasing other children and provoking fights with them.

13. Cora is supposed to have a hearing loss, but she seems to hear all right when she sits at the right end of the front row of seats.

14. Debby cannot use bathroom facilities unless someone is there to help her; she is perfectly capable of making her needs known in ample time to avoid accidents.

15. Clara has a noticeable scar on her upper lip; her speech seems to be coming through her nose, and she is hard to understand.

16. Dotty is eight; she has difficulty following the class, and doesn't seem able to learn to read at all.

17. Eight-year-old Edward sucks his thumb all the time, apparently indifferent to the reactions of parents, teachers, or other children.

18. Every few weeks, without any warning, Stella will have a violent physical convulsion during which she may bite her tongue or lose control of her sphincters; after several minutes she returns to consciousness with a severe headache, nausea, and acute feelings of depression.

19 Sylvia's height is grotesque; she towers over every other child in elementary school and wears adult-size clothes.

20. Flora has neither bladder nor bowel control and must be taken to the bathroom at frequent intervals.

21. David squints through his eye-glasses, even when he sits at the front of the room, and cannot read the blackboard or his book quite as rapidly as many of the other children.

22. Occasionally Edward will repeat a sound two or three times before he seems able to go on; he speaks when called on, but does not volunteer much.

23. Chuck doesn't seem to catch on to things as quickly as most, and needs to have things explained over and over again; eventually, though, he appears to learn everything the others do even though it has taken longer.

24. Doris is slow, absent-minded, and a daydreamer; she seems unusually quiet and withdrawn, avoids others, and is inhibited and restrained in her behavior.

25. Every hour or so, Henry stares upwards at the ceiling for several seconds and loses consciousness; he has been like this for several years but is otherwise developing normally.

26. Fred can feel the vibrations of loud music from a radio or phonograph, knows when a door has been slammed, but does not hear speech unless it is shouted.

27. Greg tires easily and needs frequent opportunities to rest; excessive stimulation or excitement must also be avoided.

28. Irv is sexually precocious; masturbates in class, uses obscene language, and has made advances to several girls in his class.

29. Harold is a capable student but has a physical defect which appears to evoke laughter, ridicule, avoidance and rejection from the other children.

30. Jane can tell the direction from which the sunshine enters her classroom; she cannot read the letters in an ordinary book.

31. Albert does not pronounce all of his speech sounds correctly, but can be understood.

32. Betty is only a little over seven, but she can read the fifth grade reader very well; however, her handwriting is poor and she is about average in most other things.

33. Chester is deceitful, tells lies, and cheats in school and at play; he has been involved in several thefts, and is a persistent truant.

34. Generally speaking, Everett can control his bladder or bowel, although he is likely to have an occasional accident.

35. Jerry does perfectly good work as long as he is left alone, he becomes extremely tense and anxious, however, whenever an adult speaks to him.

36. Virginia rubs and blinks her eyes occasionally when reading, and seems to find it difficult to distinguish between certain letters of the alphabet.

37. Andy hears most, but not everything, that is said in class even though he wears a hearing aid.

38. Stan's walk is a slow shuffle; he gets along on level surfaces or moderate inclines quite well, but is unable to manage stairs at all.

39. Roy has a bright purple birthmark which covers one cheek and the side of his neck.

40. Several times a day, Lester says he can smell bananas; usually this means that he will soon fall to the floor in a convulsion which may last for several minutes.

41. Carla is a persistent talker, whisperer and notepasser.

42. Bert could play songs with one finger on the piano when he was four; now, in first grade, he has begun composing little melodies to which he gives names like "Rainy Day", "Bert's Bike", or "Juice Time".

43. June's eyes are crossed, but she has adequate vision in either eye despite the muscle imbalance.

44. Laura's speech is laboriously slow, tortured, jerky and indistinct; her voice is monotonous in pitch, and she cannot control its intensity.

45. Harry sulks, and sometimes gets quite noisy, whenever he loses the direct attention of the teacher.

46. William can't hear anything with his left ear, but he gets along fairly well if he can sit in one row by the window, in a room on the quiet side of the building, with the class to his right.

47. Ben is unable to walk and has been confined to a wheelchair; he manages this very skillfully and needs very little help.

48. Les was born with a malformed left hand which is withered and misshapen up to the elbow.

49. When Terry was five he was run over, losing both of his legs and genitals; he gets around quite well now, but his bladder discharges into a bag which must be emptied several times a day.

50. Once or twice during the year, Peter has complained of a peculiar feeling in his stomach; about a minute afterwards he has lost consciousness, and his body has been first rigid and then convulsed for several minutes.

51. John has no difficulty on the playground or at the blackboard, but he gets quite uncomfortable when he has to use his eyes at close range for any length of time.

52. Hugh eventually mutilates or destroys everything that gets into his hands; his books are marked and torn, his desk ink-stained and scarred, and he has even managed to crack a blackboard panel.

53. When anything happens to John, the whole school knows it. A bump on the playground produces tears and wailing, an "A" for an exam bring on unrestrained shrieks of delight.

54. Jam moves about somewhat awkwardly, and his limbs are in a slight but continual tremor that becomes pronounced only when he is nervous or excited.

55. Arnold is an extremely bright nine-year-old who is far ahead of the rest of the class in most subjects; he spends a good deal of his time working on a mathematical system he calls "kinestatics".

56. Bill has difficulty in starting to talk, grimaces and strains, and repeats sounds on about half the words he says in class.

57. Kate weighs enough for two children her age; it is almost impossible for her to squeeze into the standard desk.

58. Although Melvin does not really soil himself, as the day draws on, he begins to smell more and more of feces.

59. A hearing aid provides no help for Harriet; she lip reads fairly well, and can hear when she is not facing the speaker if shouted at.

60. Helen's right hand may sometimes begin to tremble uncontrollably, during the next few minutes the spasmodic movement spreads along her arm, shoulder, and head before it finally stops.

CLASSROOM MAINSTREAMING INVENTORY

District in which you work: _____

Have you had 1 year or more of experience with mainstreaming (The process of integrating the exceptional child in the regular classroom for 1 or more periods of the day. . . . . ☐ YES ☐ NO

Your current position:

☐ Special Education Teacher

☐ Regular Classroom Teacher

☐ Principal

☐ Other _____

DIRECTIONS: Mark each item of the inventory clearly by checking one of five letters (i.e., A, B, C, D, E)

A. In regular classroom.
B. In regular classroom with the part-time help of a specialist or consultant.
C. In the regular classroom in a building with a full-time specialist.
D. In a special class or school.
E. Not for public education.

	A	B	C	D	E
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					
23.					
24.					

(Continued)

CLASSROOM MAINSTREAMING INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET
Page 2

A. In regular classroom.
B. In regular classroom with the part-time help of a specialist or consultant.
C. In the regular classroom in a building with a full-time specialist.
D. In a special class or school.
E. Not for public education.

	A	B	C	D	E
25.					
26.					
27.					
28.					
29.					
30.					
31.					
32.					
33.					
34.					
35.					
36.					
37.					
38.					
39.					
40.					
41.					
42.					
43.					
44.					
45.					
46.					
47.					
48.					
49.					
50.					
51.					
52.					
53.					
54.					
55.					
56.					
57.					
58.					
59.					
60.					

SURVEY ON MAINSTREAMING

In this survey "mainstreaming" refers to the process of integrating the exceptional child in the regular classroom for one or more periods of the day according to the needs of the individual student.

The exceptional child includes those with such handicaps/differences as:

- Visual disorders
- Hearing disabilities
- Speech and language problems
- Learning disabilities
- Behavior disorders
- Social/emotional difficulties
- Orthopedic, cosmetic, bowel and bladder problems
- Seizures
- Multiple handicaps
- Giftedness

(01) District in which you work: _____

(02) Have you had 1 year or more of experience with mainstreaming (as defined above): ☐ YES ☐ NO

(03) Your current position:

- ☐ Special Education Teacher
- ☐ Regular Education Teacher
- ☐ Principal
- ☐ Other _____

Please circle the number which most closely represents your opinion as to the importance of the following procedures to a successful mainstreaming program.

1 = Definitely Unimportant

2 = Somewhat Unimportant

3 = Somewhat Important

4 = Quite Important

5 = Vitally Important

		Definitely Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Quite Important	Vitally Important
TEACHER PREPARATION						
(04)	A positive teacher attitude toward exceptional children prior to placement of an exceptional child in that teacher's class.	1	2	3	4	5
(05)	The regular classroom teacher having knowledge of and a willingness to use community resources for children (anything from recreational facilities to welfare agencies).	1	2	3	4	5
(06)	Additional teacher training in specific competencies.	1	2	3	4	5
STUDENT PREPARATION						
(07)	Group counseling sessions for the exceptional child before he enters a regular class.	1	2	3	4	5
(08)	Preparation of the regular class before integration of an exceptional child into that class.	1	2	3	4	5
(09)	The use of a behavioral management approach (i. e., tangible or token reinforcers, social reinforcement) in mainstreamed classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
(10)	Training the exceptional child's behavior before integrating him into the regular class.	1	2	3	4	5
(11)	Training the exceptional child's behavior only after integrating him into the regular class.	1	2	3	4	5
(12)	Yearly evaluations for exceptional children in regular classes.	1	2	3	4	5
AUXILIARY PERSONNEL						
(13)	A specialist available to come into the regular classroom and demonstrate techniques for the teacher. . .	1	2	3	4	5
(14)	Released time for teachers to consult with specialists concerning exceptional children in their room.	1	2	3	4	5
(15)	A specialist to help construct individualized programs for exceptional children in a regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
(16)	A specially trained teacher for individual or small group, short-term instruction outside the regular class.	1	2	3	4	5
(17)	A trained para-professional to assist the regular classroom teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

		Definitely Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Quite Important	Vitally Important
	AUXILIARY PERSONNEL					
(18)	An itinerant teacher-specialist shared among schools to serve as consultant and temporary instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
	FACILITIES AND SERVICES					
(19)	A separate room for individual or small group instruction for integrated exceptional children.	1	2	3	4	5
(20)	A learning center for routine diagnosis of problems and construction of individual prescriptions for exceptional children in mainstreamed programs.	1	2	3	4	5
(21)	A separate class as a home room for all exceptional children where they might begin and end each day and have special instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
(22)	A wide range of abilities and age groups within a mainstreamed school.	1	2	3	4	5
(23)	Individualized instruction, such as prescriptive or precision teaching, for all children in an integrated classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
(24)	Parents of exceptional children involved in the development of an educational program for their child.	1	2	3	4	5
(25)	College courses in mainstreaming required for student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
(26)	Extension courses required of credentialed teachers taken at their time and expense.	1	2	3	4	5
(27)	A summer training program offered by the district.	1	2	3	4	5
(28)	In-service training programs by the district offered after school hours during the school year.	1	2	3	4	5
(29)	Training programs offered by the district during class time and requiring released time for teachers. . . .	1	2	3	4	5
(30)	Released time for teachers to visit other districts for observation of their mainstreaming programs.	1	2	3	4	5

Please circle the number which most closely represents your opinion as to the importance of the following auxiliary personnel for a successful mainstreaming program.

(31)	Special education teacher as consultant.	1	2	3	4	5
(32)	Specialist from outside the district.	1	2	3	4	5
(33)	School psychologist.	1	2	3	4	5

		1 Definitely Unimportant	2 Somewhat Unimportant	3 Somewhat Important	4 Quite Important	5 Vitally Important
(34)	Social worker.	1	2	3	4	5
(35)	Counselor.	1	2	3	4	5
(36)	School nurse.	1	2	3	4	5
(37)	Para-professional aides.	1	2	3	4	5
(38)	Cross-age and peer tutors.	1	2	3	4	5
(39)	Parents.	1	2	3	4	5

(40) Which statement most closely describes your attitude towards mainstreaming as defined in this survey? Please circle the appropriate number.

1 Totally opposed
2 Somewhat opposed
3 Slightly in favor
4 Generally in favor
5 Completely favorable

(41) The questions on this survey refer to current issues found in a broad survey of the literature. What issues might have been overlooked? Please describe and briefly state your opinion on these issues:

1. _____
_____
2. _____
_____
3. _____
_____
4. _____
_____
5. _____
_____